G. R. S. 59] GPB—15,000—22-7-14

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1900-1901
~~191~~ .
(Marathi)

File No. 162

Serial Nos.

Papers Filed.

*Month*_____

SUBJECT.

Complaint against the Amildar of the Maddagiri Taluk to have carried in procession the utsava idols in the two local temples at Maddagiri with the marriage pandal of his house against Manual

PREVIOUS REFERENCES. LATER REFERENCES.

MUZRAI

1901

From

THE SECRETARY TO THE
GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.

To

The Dy Commr.
Tumkur Dt.

Dated 25th March 1901

Despatched 26th

Received

General No. 1025
Muzrai F. No.

Enclosure No.

In appending in
the margin a Cutting
from the Mysore Standard
of the 20th Instant in
which the Amildar A-
Maddagiri Taluk is
alleged to have made an
attempt
in Spite of Opposition to have
the idols in the
brought
two local temples, to
~~regular procession~~ into
the marriage panda
of his house, the under-
-signed has the honor

MGCPB—11-1-1901—1500

to request that the
facts of the case may
be correctly ascertained
and reported to this
Office as early as
possible.

By order

A1

Mur Secy

to reg

facts

∴ of Maddajiri

The Amildar is sometimes very high handed in his proceedings. A few months back, he ordered the Archaks of the two temples to bring Gods in procession into the marriage pavilion he had constructed in his house for his daughter's marriage. The orthodox sect of the people objected to this novel procedure as being against Mamool But their objections were overruled. The Pujari, however, was a man of some independent spirit and as such he flatly refused to act in accordance with the wishes of the Amildar in this particular respect and after some hot conversation and intimidation on the part of the Amildar, the attempt was given up.

"Mysore Standard"
Dt 20th March 1901.

29

(General Serial No. 30.)

19 01/2

From The Deputy Commr
Dumkur Division

To The Deputy Secretary
to the Govt of Mysore
Muzrai Department
Bangalore

Dated 5 } September
Despatched 7 }

Received

General No. 267 } 1901.
No.

Enclosures Number. 1

His M. 1025 dy 26 March
last

Submitting herewith
the Report No 40 dated
31st August 1901 of the
1st Assistant
Commr on certain
allegations made in the
Mysore Standard against
the Amildar of
Maddagiri Taluk.

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date 14. 9. 01
REG. No 183
MUZRAI BRANCH

Ucdno 1479 dy 2

14/9/01

Refers
ks
14/9/01

Submitted to the Dewan
" "

This may be filed
~~recorded~~

20/9/01

~~recorded~~
ks
20/9/01

3208
R 31.1.02

4150

Recorded
MMB
17.III.02

17/3/11

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Tumkur District.

No 267
1

Tumkur 5th September 1901.
11

From

B. G. Krishnayyar Esq
Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur District.

To

L. Anantaswami Rao Esq
Deputy Secretary to the Government
of Mysore
Muzrai Department

Sir,

With reference to the Muzrai Secretary's docket No. 1025 dated the 26th March last calling for report on certain allegations made in the Mysore Standard of the 20th Idem against the Amildar of the Maddagiri Taluk, as to his having made an attempt in spite of opposition, to have the idols in the two local temples brought into the marriage pandal at his house, I have the honor to submit herewith the report No. 40 dated the 31st August 1901 of the 1st General Assistant Commissioner, Mr. Seshadri Iyengar on the subject.

2. I beg to add that it has not been satisfactorily proved that the Amildar used any abusive language, or otherwise ill treated the Archaks though he expressed his wish that the idols may be taken to the marriage pandal.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

Dy Commissioner

1902. Mis 358
2 9 1902

To No 40
Encl: 1 file

Office of the First General
Assistant Commissioner,
Tumkur District

Dated 31st August 1901.

From

C. Seshadriengar Esq
First General Assistant Commr
Tumkur District

To

B. G. Krishnaiengar Esq
Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur District.

Submitted this 6th inst.
2/9

Sir,

In returning the Duraisami Secretary's Docket No 1025 dated 25th March 1901, received with your memo No 1755 dated 27th March 1901, I have the honor to forward herewith the Statements given by the Archaks of the Sri Venkataramana Swamy and Sri Malleswara Swamy temples and the depositions of the witnesses named in the margin* and to state as follows.

2. The Amildar of Madalapuri Mr Subbaraiulu Naidu performed the marriage of his daughter during the latter part of January 1901.

* 1. Somanarasa pois
1. Balaji Rao
1. Gundur Venkatappa
1. Kumaradhar Srinivasa Raghavachar
1. Narasimha Ranga Char
5

The bridegroom and his party had come from Madras. After the Ceremony was fully over the bridegroom's relations presented a lace'd Madras Sades to the Goddesses of Sri Venkataramanaswamy and Sri Mallesswara Swamy, and requested the Amildar to have the processions of the deities brought into the marriage pavilion, stating that it was the practice in their parts to do so. The pavilion was erected on a vacant site by the side of the Amildar's house. The Amildar then enquired of the respectable inhabitants of the town and also the Archaks of both the temples regarding the request made by the bridegroom's party. Some seem to have said that the procession may be taken into the pavilion and others, that this was against the Sastras and Mamool. As there was no Concensus of opinion in the matter, the Amildar came to the fine up the idea

The procession was taken out in the streets and when it passed in the main road in front of the Amildar's house, the usual "mangalarti" etc were offered.

3. The Archak of the Malleswara Swamy temple stated that on his informing the Amildar that there was a difference of opinion among the Brahmins of the town about taking the procession into the pandal, the Amildar told him that the procession need not be brought into the pavilion and out of the five witnesses examined corroborate him. The Archak of the Venkataramana Swamy Temple stated that when he objected to the procession being taken into the pandal, the Amildar got angry on him and abused him. The only other witness Viz Narasimha Rangachar corroborates his statement.

4. The Amildar, in his explanation, says that at the request of the

bridegroom's relations, he presented 4 Madras laced Sadis to the two deities and consulted the respectable inhabitants of the town and the Archaks of the temples about taking the procession into the marriage pandal, that as there was a difference of opinion he did not insist on the same and that he did not intimidate the Archak who opposed him.

5. The Statements given by the Archak of the Sri Venkataramana Swamy and his only witness are contradicted by the Archak of the neighbouring temple and the 4 witnesses cited by the former - all of whom are respectable persons. I cannot therefore convince myself to believe that the Amildar over-ruled the objections or intimidated and insulted the Archaks. On the other hand, he seems to have readily acquiesced to the wishes of the people. All

people and the processions were taken in the streets as usual.

6. The delay in submitting this report is due to the absence of two of the witnesses from the Taluk, one of whom appeared on the 13th august 1907 and the other on the 25th august 1907.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

Abdul Rahman

First General Assistant Commr

Mo

Nuzrai

Read:—

Cutting from the "Mysore Standard" of the 20th March 1901, alleging that the Amildar of the Maddagiri Taluk (Subba-royalu Naidu) made an attempt, in spite of opposition, to have the Utsava idols in the two local temples at Maddagiri brought in procession into the marriage pandal of his house, against manual

And,

Letter No. 267, dated 5th Sept. 1901, from the Dy. Comr., Tumkur Dt., reporting that ~~the attempt alleged to have been made by Amildar Subbaroyalu Naidu was not satisfactorily proved and that~~ not actually the Utsava idols were ~~not~~ taken into the marriage pandal, the Amildar ~~in procession to his house as~~ having given up the attempt in deference alleged to the respectful entreaties of the townsfolk ~~officials~~ that the proposal was against manual.

Order thereon

Recorded

Dewan's order

Is

23/3/

Dy Secretary
Nuz: Deptt.

To

The Dy Comr., Tumkur Dt

No. 1479 D/

24/3/02